



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/728,325

12/04/2003

Michael J. Sosnoski

1842.168US1

7348

70648

7590

11/04/2008

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER/WMS GAMING

P.O. BOX 2938

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

HSU, RYAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3714

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/04/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/728,325	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SOSNOSKI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> RYAN HSU	<b>Art Unit</b> 3714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9 and 15-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9 and 15-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### DETAILED ACTION

In response to the amendments filed on 7/31/08, claims 1 and 15 have been amended.

Claims 1-7, 9, 15-24 are pending in the current application.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9, 15-16, 18-19, and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Wachi et al. (US 6,833,665 B2) and Goodwin et al. (US 5,265,273) and in further view of Loose et al. (US 2003/0087690 A1).**

Regarding claims 1, 3-4, 9, 21, and 23, Wachi et al. disclose a visual display and a panel mounted in front of the display and revealing at least a portion of the display (*see 'flat display panel main body'*[1] and *'front protective glass plate'* [3], *col. 4: ln 28-col. 5: ln 5*), the panel being coated or impregnated with a conductive material to provide shielding from electromagnetic interference (*see 'electrically conductive layer', col. 2: ln 35-55*). Furthermore, Wachi teaches of a front protective plate over an electromagnetic device that is a transparent substrate made of glass (*see col. 4: ln 60-65*). However, Wachi et al. is silent with respect to teaching a bezel encompassing the panel and being coated or impregnated with a conductive material to provide shielding from electromagnetic interference, the conductive material of the bezel being in electrical contact with the conductive material of the panel.

In an analogous display patent, Goodwin et al. teaches an electromagnetic interference (abbreviated to “EMI”) device which uses an EMI shield that is grounded to the bezel of the device (*see Fig. 2 and the related description thereof*). Goodwin teaches that the bezel placed in contact with the EMI shield is made of a conductive material in order to ground it to the front assembly (*see col. 2: ln 12-31*). Additionally, Goodwin teaches of a second panel that is mounted in front of the first panel, the second panel substantially encompassing the first panel to protect the conductive material of the first panel and additionally has a bezel encompassing the first and second panels (*see elements [42], [38] of Fig. 2 and the related description thereof*). One would be motivated to incorporate the teachings of Goodwin to ground the EMI shield of a display device because it provides an efficient and effective method of protecting using the structure of the existing display to provide the “ground” for an electrical circuit such as the EM shield without having to add any additional structure. This exploits the well-known principle in basic electronics that any conductive surface in which an electrical circuit is attached to may provide the “ground” effect necessary for the circuit to operate properly. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Goodwin with that of Wachi to provide an electromagnetic shielding device that used the conductive bezel of the device to ground the EMI shield. However the combination of Wachi with that of Goodwin is still silent with respect to fairly teaching of suggesting a “processor operative to cause a wagering game to be displayed on the visual display” and a plurality of mechanical reels and a visual display with windows to view the mechanical reels.

In a related display patent, Loose teaches a display device integrated into a gaming machine that is controlled by a processor to cause a wagering game to be displayed on the visual display (*see Fig. 11 and the related description thereof*). Additionally, Loose teaches a unique display that integrates the features of a video display and a mechanical display (*see Fig. 2(a-b)-4 and the respective related description thereof*). Loose's display device teaches of incorporating a mechanical reel display that incorporates a translucent video display affixed on top of the display in order to created a unique visual experience (*see Fig. 5-6 and the related description thereof*). The video display of Loose has the ability to switch between a transparent phase as well as an opaque phase when the processor has determined that the mechanical reel symbols should be displayed to the user. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate the features taught in Loose with that of Wachi and Goodwin in order to provide a visually enhancing experience for the user while using a display device that could withstand electromagnetic interference. The combination would yield a predictable result that is well taught in the prior art of record. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the features of Loose with that of Wachi and Goodwin to provide a gaming device with mechanical reels that could provide shielding from electromagnetic interference.

Regarding claim 2 and 16, Wachi et al. disclose a machine wherein the first panel is substantially transparent where the panel reveals the portion of the display (*see col. 2: ln 35-col. 3: ln 62*).

Regarding claim 6-7 and 18-19, Wachi et al. disclose a display wherein the panel is comprised of glass (*see col. 2: ln 44-55*). Additionally, the panel is coated with a film containing indium tin oxide (*see col. 6: ln 10-col. 8: ln 32*).

Regarding claim 15, Wachi et al. disclose an assembly for a gaming machine that conducts a wagering game, the assembly comprising: a panel positioned in front of a visual display of the machine and revealing at least a portion of the display (*see col. 4: ln 28-col. 5: ln 5*); and a bezel encompassing the panel, each of the panel and the bezel being coated or impregnated with a conductive material to provide shielding from electromagnetic interference (*see col. 2: ln 35-55*). Furthermore, Wachi teaches of a front protective plate over an electromagnetic device that is a transparent substrate made of glass (*see col. 4: ln 60-65*). However, Wachi is silent with respect to a teaching the bezel being in electrical contact with the conductive material of the panel.

In an analogous display patent, Goodwin et al. teaches an electromagnetic interference (abbreviated to “EMI”) device which uses an EMI shield that is grounded to the bezel of the device (*see Fig. 2 and the related description thereof*). Goodwin teaches that the bezel placed in contact with the EMI shield is made of a conductive material in order to ground it to the front assembly (*see col. 2: ln 12-31*). Additionally, Goodwin teaches of a second panel that is mounted in front of the first panel, the second panel substantially encompassing the first panel to protect the conductive material of the first panel and additionally has a bezel encompassing the first and second panels (*see elements [42], [38] of Fig. 2 and the related description thereof*). One would be motivated to incorporate the teachings of Goodwin to ground the EMI shield of a display device because it provides an efficient and effective method of protecting using the

Art Unit: 3714

structure of the existing display to provide the “ground” for an electrical circuit such as the EM shield without having to add any additional structure. This exploits the well-known principle in basic electronics that any conductive surface in which an electrical circuit is attached to may provide the “ground” effect necessary for the circuit to operate properly. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Goodwin with that of Wachi to provide an electromagnetic shielding device that used the conductive bezel of the device to ground the EMI shield.

Regarding claims 22 and 24, Wachi et al. Goodwin and Loose teach to form a gaming machine that has an electromagnetic display panel as a display device. The instant claims are directed towards the glass panels on a gaming machine to include artwork for the visual display. It has been old and well known in the art that surfaces of a game machine may be decorated with thematic artwork for a visual display of a game machine as to attract customers to play the game. Therefore the Examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE with respect to the limitations of claims 22 and 24 that one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that it was an obvious feature to add artwork to display surface of a gaming machine. Furthermore it would have been equally noticed that adding artwork to the visual display would not change the structure of the game machine and it would perform the same function with or without the artwork. There it would have also been a simple matter of design choice to add artwork to the surface of a display apparatus.

**Claims 5 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wachi et al. and Goodwin et al. and Loose as applied to claims above, and further in view of Takahashi et al. (US 6,884,936 B2).**

Regarding claims 5 and 17, Wachi et al., Goodwin et al. and Loose teach a display that contains a layer that is coated with a conductive material to provide shielding from electromagnetic interference. However, Wachi, Goodwin and Loose are silent with respect to the amount of shielding effectiveness for its display. In an analogous display patent, Takahashi et al. teaches a display shield film that is capable of reducing noise by a level of at least 7 dB (*see Fig. 22 and the related description thereof*). Takahashi teaches that one would be motivated to incorporate these types of electromagnetic shielding films into display devices in order to protect any harmful radiation that may be emitted from the display devices. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that although Wachi did not teach a reduction of noise by shielded screen it was a property that existed and that a 7 dB reduction was capable of being performed at the time the invention was made.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after



Art Unit: 3714

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RYAN HSU whose telephone number is (571)272-7148. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 :00-17:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hotaling can be reached on (571)-272-4434. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John M Hotaling II/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3714

RH  
10/31/08